

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as allegedly being “anticipated” by Hylton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,961). While not acquiescing in this rejection or in the characterizations of Hylton et al. in the office action, claims 1-4 and 6 have been amended. The discussion below makes reference to the amended claims.

Hylton et al. discloses the wireless distribution of digital broadband information within a customer premises. As described beginning at col. 2, line 64, a shared processing system receives a plurality of multiplexed channels, e.g., from one of several exemplary broadband digital networks. Each multiplexed channel contains a digitally multiplexed data stream including digitized broadband information relating to a plurality of programs. The shared processing system includes a plurality of channel selectors. Each channel selector selects one of the received multiplexed channels. A plurality of program selectors processes the selected channels. Specifically, each program selector selects digitized broadband information related to a selected program from a channel selected by one of the channel selectors. A multiplexer multiplexes the selected digitized broadband information from the program selectors into a transport stream. A transmitter system provides a wireless broadcast of the digital transport stream throughout the premises.

With respect to claim 1, Hylton et al. does not disclose a retransmission device that collectively receives a plurality of high-frequency signals of different broadcast signaling systems. In the non-limiting illustrative embodiments of the subject patent application, CS broadcast, BS broadcast, terrestrial broadcast and CATV are provided as examples of different broadcast signaling systems. The shared processing system 10 of Hylton et al. (which the office action alleges to correspond to the claimed retransmission device) receives signals from a digital

broadband network 5, but there is no disclosure in Hylton et al. to the effect that this network contains signals of different broadcast signaling systems.

In this regard, the office action makes reference to, inter alia, col. 5, lines 12-15 of Hylton et al. which state that “[t]he system 10 may connect to a number of different types of digital broadband networks 5, including hybrid fiber-coax networks, switched digital video type fiber to the curb networks and wireless digital broadcast networks.” The office action also makes reference to col. 5, lines 33-41, which state that “[d]ifferent types of networks 5 will utilize different transport protocols and signal formats.” However, these portions of Hylton et al. do not describe that the system 10 be connected to “collectively” receive signals from more than one of these “different types of networks”. Rather, these portions of Hylton et al. must be read in the overall context of the specification and disclosure, which describes that the system 10 receives a plurality of multiplexed channels, e.g., from one of several exemplary broadband digital networks as noted at col. 2, line 66. For example, Figure 7 of Hylton et al. shows that all tuners of the channel selectors are CATV tuners. There is no disclosure of receiving signals from any broadcast system other a CATV system. Because Hylton et al. does not disclose “collectively” receiving a plurality of signals of different broadcast signaling systems, Hylton et al. cannot anticipate claim 1 or its dependent claims 2-4 and 6 as alleged in the office action.

Claims 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being “obvious” over Hylton et al. in view of Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 5,402,183). While not acquiescing in this rejection or in the assertions regarding the forced combination of Hylton et al. and Tanaka, claims 5 and 7 have been amended.

First, Tanaka does not remedy the deficiencies of Hylton et al. with respect to claim 1, from which claims 5 and 7 depend. For this reason alone, the proposed combination would not have made claims 5 and 7 obvious. In addition, Tanaka does not disclose the subject matter of these dependent claims. For example, with respect to claim 5, the Examiner relies on Tanaka to cure the acknowledged deficiencies of Hylton et al. regarding the claimed power switching means. Tanaka discloses that apparatuses such as a video tape recorder not needed by an AV center or a television can be powered off. Applicants respectfully submit that the on/off switching of external device such as a video tape recorder would not have suggested the claimed

on/off switching of receivers and demodulators as claimed. In any event, Tanaka does not remedy the deficiencies of Hylton et al. with respect to claim 1, from which claim 5 depends.

New claims 8-23 have been added. The subject matter of these new claims is fully supported by the original disclosure and no new matter is added.

Claim 8 is directed to a retransmission apparatus comprising a plurality of receiver sections each of which receives a broadcast signal of a different broadcast system; a signal selector for selecting outputs of one or more of the receiver sections; a converter section for converting the selected receiver section outputs into signals of a common signaling system; and a transmitter section for transmitting the common signaling system signals. Applicants respectfully submit that the applied documents do not disclose or suggest such an apparatus and thus claim 8 and its dependent claims 9-21 are believed to be allowable.


Claim 22 is directed to a retransmission apparatus comprising a plurality of receiver sections each of which receives a broadcast signal of a different broadcast system; a plurality of modulators for respectively modulating an output of a corresponding one of the receiver sections; a signal selector for selecting outputs of one or more of the modulators; a converter for converting the selected modulator outputs into signals of a common signaling system; and a transmitter section for transmitting the common signaling system signals. Applicants respectfully submit that the applied documents do not disclose or suggest a retransmission apparatus having, for example, receiver sections and modulators arranged in the manner specified in claim 22. Consequently, claim 22 and its dependent claim 23 are believed to be allowable.

SHIBATA et al.
Appl. No. 09/920,296
Response to Office Action dated July 14, 2005

The pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Michael J. Shea
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100